

U.S. Application Serial No. 09/614,161

R E M A R K S

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated July 27, 2005, where the Examiner rejected claims 30-32 and 37-43. More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 30-32, 37-42(?), under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannatta et al., US Patent No. 5,924,044; in view of Wiedeman et al., US Patent No. 6,064,857; and claim 43 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannatta et al. '044, and Wiedeman et al., '857, in further view of Bakcr et al., US Patent No. 6,317,597. However in reviewing the references in view of the claims, as presently amended, the references being relied upon fail to make known or obvious the same. Namely, none of the references make known or obvious the altering of "a cellular telephone capability including the rate at which data is transmitted, responsive to sensing the remote power source coupled to the cellular telephone" (claim 30), nor do the references make known or obvious "digital circuitry" included as part of the apparatus detachably coupled to the portable wireless communication device "to provide additional digital data processing support for the control circuitry" (claim 37), or "cooperative data processing in both the first processing circuitry and a second processing circuitry ... when the external apparatus including the second processing circuitry is coupled to the communication device" (claim 41).

In the rejection of each of the claims, the Examiner has relied upon Wiedeman et al., '857, however with respect to multiple data rates, Wiedeman et al., '857, selectively couples one or both of a battery and high energy density capacitor in response to a determined data rate, as opposed to the claim 30 of the present application, which alters a cellular telephone capability including the rate at which data is transmitted, responsive to sensing the remote power source coupled to the cellular telephone. In essence, the cause and effect are reversed relative to the reference being relied upon by the Examiner and the corresponding claims of the present application, such that the teaching from the reference can not be said to make known the features of the claims. As a result, the references relied upon by the Examiner fails to make known independent claim 30, and the corresponding dependent claims.

Relative to independent claims 37 and 41, and the respective dependent claims, the Examiner has failed to identify in the references, and the references fail to teach or suggest, analogous elements corresponding to the claimed "digital circuitry" (claim 37), and "cooperative data processing" including "second processing circuitry" (claim 41). As a result, the Examiner

U.S. Application Serial No. 09/614,161

has failed to present a proper rejection relative to independent claims 37 and 41, and any of the corresponding dependent claims. None of the above noted deficiencies are accounted for in the further teachings of Baker et al., '597, which is additionally cited in connection with claim 43.

For reasons presented above, the applicant contends, that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Consequently, the applicant would request that the Examiner reexamine and reconsider the claims in view of the above noted reasons. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: Lawrence J. Chapa
Lawrence J. Chapa
Reg. No. 39,135
Phone (847) 523-0340
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Mobile Devices
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, RM AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048